

REMARKS

After entry of this Amendment, claims 1-5, 6, 8-14, 16-28, 54, 55-59, 61-67, 69, 71-90, and 94-101 are pending in this application. Claims 7, 15, 29-53, 60, 68, 70, and 91-93 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 6, 8, 10, 16, 54, 59, 61, 63, 69, and 83 are amended and claims 95-109 are added without introduction of new matter. Support for the amended language and new claims is self-evident or evident from the discussion below.

Claims 1-28 and 78-82 are allowed. Independent claims 1 and 78 are not amended. However, allowed dependent claims 6, 8, 10, 16, 59, 61, 63, and 69 are amended to recite particular and relative donor concentrations of the recited implant region portions in lieu of reciting implant doses for those portions. Non-limiting support for the amended language of claims 6, 8, 10, 16, 59, 61, 63, and 69 is provided by at least paragraphs 23-26, 28, 30, 32, 34, and 36 of Applicant's disclosure (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0087782). The amended claims are allowable at least in view of their dependence upon allowed independent claim 1.

Claims 54, 56-59, 61-67, 69, and 71-73 are withdrawn. Independent claim 54 is amended to recite all features, *verbatim*, of allowed claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 54 and claims 56-59, 61-67, 69, and 71-73 depending therefrom are allowable under MPEP § 806.04(d).

Claims 83-92 and 94 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0006237 to Abe. Independent Claim 83 is amended to recite the allowable subject matter of claim 93 and the intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.


New claims 95-109 are added by this Amendment. Claims 95 and 104 are independent. Claims 96-103 and 105-109 depend directly or indirectly from either claim 95 or 104. Non-limiting support for claims 95-109 is provided by at least paragraphs 23-36 of Applicant's disclosure. Independent claims 95 and 104 recite a combination of implant region portions which distinguish over the cited art. For instance, though different in scope, each of claims 95 and 104 recite first, second, and third portions "wherein at least one of said portions extends further toward a region of said substrate beneath said gate than another one of said portions and said portions have respective donor concentrations that are equal or decrease in order of said

first, second, and third portions". Abe does not teach this combination of features at least because the "n-" 40 and "n" 39 regions, cited as teaching the claimed second and third portions in the above rejection, have lesser and greater donor concentrations, respectively. Applicants also note that Abe's "p+" region 27, cited as teaching the claimed fourth portion in the above rejection, is not of the same conductivity type as Abe's regions 26, 40, and 41 (cited as teaching the first, second, and third regions, respectively).

As all outstanding issues are believed to be addressed, Applicants respectfully request that this application be passed to issue.

Dated: May 25, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By  #41,198

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

Steven T. Dickey

Registration No.: 54,066

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006-5403

(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicant